

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION

LEODIUS CLARK,

Petitioner,

v.

OHIO ADULT PAROLE
AUTHORITY, et al.,

Respondents.

CASE NO. 2:16-CV-00204

2:16-CV-00413

2:16-CV-00414

JUDGE JAMES L. GRAHAM

Magistrate Judge Kimberly A. Jolson

OPINION AND ORDER

On February 6, 2017, the Magistrate Judge issued a *Report and Recommendation* recommending that Respondent's *Motion to Dismiss* (ECF No. 16) be granted, that Petitioner's *Motion to Amend* (ECF No. 19) be denied, that Petitioner's *Motion to Stay Proceedings* (ECF No. 18) be denied, and that this consolidated action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 be dismissed. (ECF No. 22.) Petitioner has filed an *Objection* to the Magistrate Judge's *Report and Recommendation*. (ECF No. 23.)

Petitioner objects to all of the Magistrate Judge's recommendations, with the exception of the Magistrate Judge's recommendation that his request for monetary damages be denied. Petitioner again raises all of the same arguments he previously presented.

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b), this Court has conducted a *de novo* review. For the reasons already well detailed in the Magistrate Judge's *Report and Recommendation*, Petitioner's *Objection* (ECF No. 23) is **OVERRULED**. The *Report and Recommendation* (ECF No. 22) is **ADOPTED** and **AFFIRMED**. Petitioner's *Motion to Amend* (ECF No. 19) is **DENIED**. Petitioner's *Motion to Stay Proceedings* (ECF No. 18) is **DENIED**. Respondent's *Motion to Dismiss* (ECF No. 16) is **GRANTED**. This action is hereby **DISMISSED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: March 17, 2017

s/James L. Graham

JAMES L. GRAHAM

United States District Judge